DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 318 SO 003 514

AUTHOR	Eckland, Bruce K.
TITLE	Research Workshop Report. Sociological Theory and Research in Education.
INSTITUTION	National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, D. C. Committee on Basic Research in Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	75p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Psychology; *Educational Research; *Educational Sociology; Grants; Research Methodology; Research Projects; *Socialization; Social Psychology; *Sociology; Workshops

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this workshop was to critically examine projects of nine young sociologists and social psychologists who were finalists in the small-grant program for new PhDs sponsored by the Committee on Basic Research in Education (COBRE). Since the awardees who attended the workshop had no prior training or research experience directly related to education, it was also part of the purpose to broaden their knowledge of the current state of sociological theory and research in education. Contained in this workshop report are: 1) an introduction and summary, spelling out the background, rationale, specific objectives, and preliminary results of the workshop; 2) an abstract of each research project and brief report of the workshop discussion on it; 3) descriptions of statements by resource people brought in for the workshop--from Educational Testing Service, National Opinion Research Center, and American Institutes for Research; and 4) papers presented by three consultants, each well known for his contribution to basic research in educational sociology--"Salient Themes in Theory and Research on the Sociology of Education" by C. Arnold Anderson; "On the Significance of Educational Organizations" by Ronald G. Corwin; and "Socialization and Personality in Education: A View From Social Psychology" by Glen H. Elder, Jr. (Author/JLB)

ED 067318

COBRE Research Workshop
on
SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
May 2-7, 1971
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

SO003514

1

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COBRE Research Workshop

on

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
May 2-7, 1971
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina

WORKSHOP REPORT "SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION"
by Bruce K. Eckland

1. "Salient Themes in Theory and Research on the Sociology of Education" by C. Arnold Anderson

2. "On the Significance of Educational Organizations" by Ronald G. Corwin

3. "Socialization and Personality in Education: A View From Social Psychology" by Glen H. Elder, Jr.

RESEARCH WORKSHOP REPORT

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Myrtle Beach
South Carolina

May 2-7, 1971

Sponsored by the

COMMITTEE ON BASIC RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES-NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

and the

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF EDUCATION

Workshop Director: Dr. Bruce K. Eckland, University of North Carolina

Workshop Coordinators: Mr. Byron A. Matthews, University of Maryland
Mr. James W. Michaels, University of North Carolina

FOREWORD

In 1967 the research arm of the Office of Education conferred with leaders of the National Academy of Education and the National Academy of Sciences on strategies to enlarge the disciplinary base of research supported by the Office of Education. From this relationship emerged the Office of Education's support of the Committee on Basic Research in Education (COBRE), housed in the National Research Council. The activities of the Committee were to be funded for three to four years. Strategies developed by COBRE were to be passed on to the Office of Education for consideration in the management of its research support programs.

The final report of the Committee on Basic Research in Education is still in preparation. However, useful ideas have already been made to the Office of Education. Included are (1) the need to give special concerted attention to the social science disciplines if they are to become significantly involved in research of relevance to education, (2) the desirability of stimulating participation on the part of younger scientists by means of small grants, (3) the utilization of prospectuses in the proposal review process, and (4) the creative capability of broad multidisciplinary panels in the proposal review process.

The Office of Education has established a special research support program utilizing the above concepts. This program provides support for research conducted by economists and anthropologists and will include political scientists in fiscal year 1973 with the possible phasing in of other disciplines in fiscal year 1974. The program has incorporated many of the features

suggested by the COBRE experience: smaller grants aimed at the work of younger scientists, initial review based on prospectuses instead of full-scale proposals, and a broad multidisciplinary review panel for evaluating the prospectuses and followup proposals. In addition to this special program, the regular basic research program of the Office of Education has a social science proposal review panel which recommends support of research proposed by social scientists including, in a major way, that of sociologists.

The Office of Education is greatly indebted to the scientists who have given of their talents and efforts in the work of the Committee on Basic Research in Education. Their efforts have already influenced the management and the operation of research funding programs of the Office of Education and will continue to do so. This workshop on sociological theory and research in education is one of eight workshops sponsored by COBRE, and is unique among the eight in that it is targeted specifically at the younger scientists. The contacts and progress made at this workshop will be followed up by staff of the Office of Education. In fact, one of the young scholars at the workshop has already been involved in observing and evaluating the dynamics of the panel process in reviewing basic research proposals by the Office of Education.

Howard F. Hjelm
Director, Division of Research
National Center for Educational
Research and Development
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

At a small motel called the Sea Islands located in a secluded area on the north end of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, nine young sociologists and social psychologists met for a five-day workshop, May 2-7, 1971. They were joined by a small group of consultants and senior colleagues drawn from the specialty of the sociology of education.

All of the young nine were finalists in the small-grant program for new PhDs sponsored by the Committee on Basic Research in Education (COBRE). The small-grant program was designed to stimulate research in education among promising young scholars from the basic disciplines. Most of the awardees from sociology who attended the May workshop had no prior training or research experience directly related to education. The purpose of the workshop was to examine critically the projects upon which these young investigators were about to begin work, and to broaden their knowledge of the current state of sociological theory and research in education.

Background and Specific Objectives

This workshop grew out of the activities of COBRE sponsored through the National Research Council by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Education, and by the U.S. Office of Education which also provided financial support. Part of COBRE's responsibilities in the past three years has been to strengthen the links between the scientific community and the U.S. Office of Education through the identification of

promising individuals in the disciplines and the stimulation of new research in these disciplines on educationally relevant problems.

COBRE's first effort involved the development of a new grant program funded by the U.S. Office of Education for the support of unsolicited basic research in education. Of the several hundred proposals that were reviewed from 1968 through 1970, while many fulfilled the committee's objectives, a large proportion had been submitted by researchers who already were well-established in their fields and whose work was an extension of interests in education they had been pursuing for some years.

Searching for a better method to identify and strengthen the educational community's link with the young and competent investigator whose interests and commitments might not be so firm, COBRE announced a new small-grant program in 1970. Applications were restricted to persons who had received their doctorates within the previous five years; and, since the program was designed to stimulate new research, a formal proposal was not required. The applicants were asked to submit only (1) a curriculum vitae, (2) a copy of one publication or manuscript, and (3) a two-page statement describing the research they proposed to develop and explaining its potential relevance to education.

About 10 percent of the 443 applications to the small-grant program for new PhDs were submitted by sociologists. These generally were very promising young scholars, as evidenced by the fact that they won over 20 percent of the awards.

The idea of inviting the small-grant finalists in sociology to a research workshop developed out of a planning session at the National Research Council in April, 1970. Attending this meeting were Bruce K. Eckland and James S. Coleman, COBRE members; Ronald G. Corwin, Ohio State University,

Robert E. Herriott, Florida State University; and COBRE staff members, Sherman Ross and Barbara Meeker. The meeting had been called to discuss plans for a research workshop in the sociology of education, which was one of a series of COBRE workshops then in the initial stages of planning.

However, rather than centering the workshop on "state of the art" papers and extending invitations to investigators who could easily be identified by the contributions they already had made to the field, it was decided to bring together a group of young sociologists who were interested in theoretical and methodological issues and show them how these issues could embrace educationally relevant research. The small-grant program for new PhDs appeared to be the natural vehicle for identifying such persons.

The focus upon young investigators reflected the planning group's recognition of the unhappy state of sociological research about education. Over the past several decades, sociology has markedly increased its scientific rigor in basic research, while struggling to free itself from the cast of social philosophy. In the process, sociology broke its original ties with education many years ago, which allowed the field of educational sociology to become dominated by American colleges of education. Despite some notable exceptions, not until about 1960 did sociologists generally seek a rapproachment (cf., Orville Brim, Sociology and the Field of Education). Yet, many sociologists unfortunately still view the "sociology of education" as a parochial, non-theoretical, and not too rigorous specialty.

One can, of course, point to many competent sociologists who have made important contributions to educational research. It is noteworthy, however, that such persons generally have come to the field of education "through the back door," without much prior knowledge or training in educationally relevant problems. Initially having an interest in some theoretical or

methodological issue in sociology, they find schools a convenient place to pursue their interest. Or, they discover that many important social processes are dependent upon what happens in education, such as the role schools play in facilitating or inhibiting social mobility. The effects, and sometimes the processes, of education then become critical variables in the sociologist's analysis.

Thus, charged with promoting sound and imaginative research in the sociology of education, COBRE's goal became one of enlarging "the back door." The workshop, we thought, might be one means of doing this. The small-grant program would identify the kinds of young investigators we wanted to encourage. The workshop, in turn, would bring this group together to learn from each other and from a small cadre of consultants whose job it would be to act as referees and to provide brief statements on the future development of sociological theory and research in education. We decided also to invite representatives from several of the more prominent organizations across the country doing educational research and ask them to discuss the kinds of resources their agencies could provide sociologists in pursuit of their particular interests.

Organizing the Workshop

Invitations to attend the workshop were sent to the young investigators shortly after the small-grant awards were announced in January and February, 1971. Among the awardees, more than twenty were sociologists and social psychologists, and therefore potential candidates for the workshop. However, we had planned only for ten. While it is unfortunate that we could not extend invitations to the entire group, the abundance of highly qualified

candidates made it possible to achieve some balance and avoid a heavy concentration of individuals in any one area of study. The variety and complementariness of research interests is evident in the project reviews presented in the next section of this report.

The group eventually was reduced to nine due to a last-minute cancellation. Each of the young investigators prepared a written statement describing the research he was pursuing, or had planned. These statements (in most cases simply elaborations of the proposals previously submitted to COBRE in connection with the small-grant program) were circulated among the participants prior to the meeting.

Joining this group for the full five days were three consultants, each well-known for his contribution to basic research in educational sociology. Each was asked to prepare a paper setting forth from his own perspective what the most promising lines of sociological inquiry in education appear to him to be.

Representatives from Educational Testing Service, the National Opinion Research Center, and American Institute for Research were invited for two or three days each. Acting both as resource persons for their organizations and as educational researchers in their own right, each made a distinctive contribution to the workshop. The group also was bolstered by the participation of a small group of observers from the National Research Council staff and the U.S. Office of Education.

The agenda for the meetings was arranged with two basic goals in mind: (1) to give each of the young investigators an opportunity to present and defend the research project he was engaged in, or planning, and (2) to provide a place and time for the participants to interact informally. The program that we followed is presented here.

Sunday, May 2

Evening Session

Bruce Eckland Barbara Meeker	Welcoming remarks, housekeeping chores, and an introduction to COBRE and its sponsors.

Monday, May 3

Morning Session

Glen Elder	Socialization and personality in education: a view from social psychology
Jerome Dusek	An investigation of adult expectations as they affect children's learning and performance
Carolyn Perrucci	Socialization and social control among women in the professions

Afternoon Session

Paul Roman	Career adjustments among academicians during middle age
Miles Simpson	Education and authoritarianism: a Mexican study
Jay Davis	Research in the social sciences at Educational Testing Service

Tuesday, May 4

Morning Session

Joe Spaeth	Research in the social sciences at the National Opinion Research Center
Ronald Corwin	On the significance of educational organizations

Evening Session

Barry Anderson	School bureaucratization and pupil achievement
Michael Useem	The creation and impact of linkages between the social sciences and the federal government

Wednesday, May 5

Morning Session

John Claudy	The American Institutes for Research and the Project TALENT data bank
Arnold Anderson	Salient themes in theory and research on the sociology of education

Afternoon Session

Michael Hannan	Societal development and the expansion of educational systems
Thomas Mayer	Spectral analysis and educational indicators

Thursday, May 6

Morning Session

David Segal	Higher education as a factor in labor force mobility
Howard Hjelm	Comments on the National Center for Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education

Evening Session

The school as an institution*

Friday, May 7

Morning Session

School and society*

Finally, a word about the setting. The Sea Islands is a small ocean front motel. Being off-season in early May, our group had the motel largely to itself. A penthouse on the upper story was used for our formal sessions

*These topics were chosen by the young investigators for discussion in the final two sessions. In order to increase the level of participation, we split into two smaller groups during the first half of each session and regrouped for the second half.

and as a lounge for informal gatherings. Our decision favoring double-occupancy in room assignments worked out quite well, too, both in terms of creating a more collegial atmosphere and reducing costs. The structured program and the isolated setting combined to make spending nearly all of our formal and informal moments with each other almost unavoidable.

Preliminary Results

No single yardstick is adequate for evaluating a workshop of this kind. We can offer here some comments and testimonials about what we accomplished and didn't accomplish; and we have provided summaries in the following pages of the discussion at our formal sessions. Yet, some of the most significant results of the workshop no doubt were achieved in private rooms, on the beach, at poolside, and over dinner. Moreover, the effects for some participants will not be recognized until they are well along in their careers.

Remembering that one of COBRE's main objectives was to open some of the "back doors" of the educational establishment to the young, discipline-oriented scholar, we may not know for many years to what extent we succeeded. A week or so after the workshop, one of the awardees, for example, wrote that the intensity of the experience built one or two friendships that he expects will endure and that will prove to be intellectually productive in the future.

Several other awardees wrote that they not only had broadened considerably their knowledge of the contributions sociological theory and research may make to education, but gained many useful suggestions and needed reinforcement regarding their own research plans. The consultants and resource

persons were complimented, too, for helping them to achieve a sense for the field, its general outlook, its differing styles, and its relevant problems.

The letters also offered suggestions about how such a workshop could be improved if one were to plan another in the future. Although the group size seemed about right with a sufficient number to provide a diversity of perspectives but small enough to insure that everybody got acquainted, some of the participants felt that we selected too many of our resource people from outside of sociology. They believe it may have been better to have invited one or two additional individuals who either were more central to the field or who had some practical experience in school administration or other school-related problems. A couple of the participants also mentioned that the manner in which we split the participants into two groups on the last two days provided a particularly good opportunity to exchange views, and they wished that we had done this earlier and more frequently. We agree.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

(In order of appearance)

Investigator: Jerome B. Dusek

Project Title: An investigation of adult expectations as they affect children's learning and performance.

Abstract:

Three separate experiments were proposed that would provide information relevant to the following questions: a. Are teacher expectancy effects observable in measures of academic performance? b. Are expectancy effects obtained only when the expectancy is induced in the adult as opposed to being self-generated by the adult? c. Are there developmental trends in susceptibility to adult expectancy effects?

Discussion:

Discussion focused upon sex role differences and the kinds of reinforcements or sanctions that teachers employ in the classroom and the need to take these differences into account when investigating teacher or adult expectancy effects. Girls, for example, tend to receive more positive reinforcement than boys (boys get punished more). What are the consequences of such patterns in the socialization of the child and in preparing him or her for adult roles?

The group also asked whether or not demands for inhibition and control in the classroom tend to be independent of and often preclude the teacher's ability to treat individual students in any way other than according to the most universalistic standards of conduct. If this is the case, one would not anticipate strong teacher expectancy effects of the kind that require differential treatment.

Investigator: Carolyn C. Perrucci

Project Title: Socialization and social control among women in the professions.

Abstract:

American women with professional degrees are less likely to pursue careers on a long-term basis than men in comparable fields. This variation in work activity may result in part from women being improperly socialized with respect to the norms and values of a profession and, consequently, being less subject to social control by such norms and colleagial relationships.

Data will be collected by mail questionnaire from a stratified random sample of faculty and students in engineering and science at a large mid-western university. It is hypothesized that women are subjected to inconsistent expectations from agents of socialization in professional schools and, more importantly, to patterns of rewards for performance that either exceed or fall short of those received by men. Thus, female students may be over-rewarded for average performance due to low expectations regarding her performance, or vice versa. Subjected to such disjunctive behavior-reward patterns, women will be less likely to pursue professional careers and will be less knowledgeable of and committed to the professional values of their fields.

Discussion:

Several questions were raised of a methodological nature, including: a. Can one rely upon verbal reports when it is quite probable that the respondents are not particularly aware of behavioral differentials of the kind being investigated here? b. Given current campus discussions of sexism, is it possible to obtain non-reactive, uncontaminated measures regarding the differential treatment of women?

Investigator: Paul M. Roman

Project Title: Career adjustments among academicians during middle age.

Abstract:

The proposed study explores mid-career work role changes among academic professionals, especially when career adjustments are made in response to obsolescence. Through an analysis of secondary data on national samples of faculty and through personal interviews with selected groups of specialists, the plan is to construct a typology of mid-career work role changes, such as: (1) the professor who changes areas of interest in mid-career; (2) the professor who shows a decline in productivity in mid-career and who increases his interest and activity in teaching; (3) the professor who moves into or aspires to an administrative position in mid-career; (4) the professor who undertakes work on a magnum opus in mid-career as a possible means of postponing productivity demands; or (5) the professor who changes in mid-career from a pattern of independent research and writing to extensive collaboration with others. The data also will be analyzed to determine when adjustments of this kind occur during one's career, and to identify the determinants of each pattern.

Discussion:

Problems of conceptualization and the measurement of "obsolescence" were reviewed at some length. The discussants, for instance, pointed out that inferior training early in one's career may confound the measurement of mid-career obsolescence--some PhDs are obsolete the day their degree is granted. It also was noted that obsolescence may be particularly difficult to disentangle from other factors when a professor shifts areas of specialization.

Investigator: Miles E. Simpson

Project Title: Education and authoritarianism: A Mexican study.

Abstract:

Prior research has shown that in the U.S. and Finland education from the lowest grades to the university appears to reduce authoritarianism in adults, and the relationship is more or less linear. In Mexico and Costa Rica, however, the effects of education on authoritarianism do not begin to appear until after the 10th grade.

Mexican and American trained teachers (and their students) will be examined in several Mexican border schools in order to test the hypothesis that authoritarianism is reduced not merely by the experience of education but because educational systems usually are manned by middle class teachers who are nonauthoritarian and they resocialize more authoritarian working class students. However, in comparison with the U.S., Mexico may be dominated by a more authoritarian middle class. Teachers from this middle class, unless themselves resocialized in another cultural context (like in the U.S.), will simply perpetuate the predominant cultural values.

Discussion:

Discussion centered on the research design and, in particular, the difficulty of ruling out alternative hypotheses which could explain the same results that are anticipated. For example, Mexican teachers who were trained in the U.S. may be less authoritarian than those who were trained in their own country to begin with or, equally plausible, less authoritarian teachers simply may be more heavily concentrated in the higher grade levels in Mexico than in the U.S. regardless of the origin of their training. In any case, the study should attempt to sort out the effects of teachers as mediators of authoritarian values from the effects of other educational processes.

Investigator: Barry D. Anderson

Project Title: School bureaucratization and pupil achievement.

Abstract:

The primary goal of this study is to test the hypothesis that there is a causal chain linking socio-economic status, school bureaucratization, feelings of personal causation, and pupil achievement. The nature of the chain is that low socio-economic background in students leads to high school bureaucratization, which leads students to feel alienated, which leads to poor achievement. Instruments measuring these four variables will be administered to pupils in some 20 elementary schools. Path analysis will be used.

Discussion:

Many of the participants' questions dealt with the conceptualization and measurement of bureaucratization. The investigator had proposed to construct an index based upon how the students see that their school is run. The following points were made about this procedure: a. If student perceptions of bureaucracy differ substantially from the "ideal type" as objectively defined in the literature, would it not be appropriate to call it by another name? b. The concept, as subjectively measured, may too closely approximate the students' feelings of powerlessness, thus confounding its association with another variable in the researcher's model, namely alienation. c. It may not be possible to link the cognitive or personality and the social structural levels in this analysis if the structural measures are limited to the subjective impressions of students.

Investigator: Michael Useem

Project Title: The creation and impact of linkages between the social sciences and the federal government.

Abstract:

What is the influence of formal institutional linkages between the American social science disciplines and the federal government on scholarly activities in the social sciences? Formal linkages will be taken here to include substantial federal financial backing of research, presence of social scientists on government panels or consultantships or in full-time administrative positions in federal agencies, and involvement in research centers primarily dependent on federal contracts. Information gathered from political scientists and sociologists, some who have and some who have not had some type of major formal contact with the federal government during the past five years, will be examined to determine the social processes by which these persons gain and maintain contact with the government, and the impact of such ties on their work as social scientists, such as research directions.

Discussion:

How does one sort out the extent to which the development of different lines of scholarly inquiry in the social sciences are internally or externally controlled? This was the main question posed by the discussants. To find out whether or not researchers gravitate to where the money is, one must know how funding decisions are made and who makes them. For example, evaluation committees in the federal government that review social science proposals usually are composed of social scientists. Is this a form of internal or external control on the discipline? On the other hand, much research is brought by federal agencies on a contract basis and here the evaluation process may be quite different.

Investigator: Michael T. Hannan

Project Title: Societal development and the expansion of educational systems.

Abstract:

Empirical research and theoretical arguments have established the causal importance of the expansion of educational systems for both economic and political development, as well as the reverse causal relations. However, the processes involved are not well understood.

The research proposed for addressing these issues is a 140 nation panel analysis employing data on educational enrollments, economic development, political development, and several other features of social organization gathered at five year intervals for the time period 1950-70. The analysis depends heavily on regression-based techniques of causal analysis.

A major component of the proposed research is methodological investigation dealing primarily with techniques both for constructing reliable and valid indicators as well as for adequately dealing with a variety of types of measurement error. Considerable attention will be devoted to the construction of potentially falsifiable models.

Discussion:

Discussion focused upon methodological problems, including the independence of units, i.e., the nations, the complexity and stability of the major variables, and the choice of time intervals. Some concern also was expressed about the author's inductive approach in specifying the relationships among variables.

Investigator: Thomas F. Mayer

Project Title: Spectral analysis and educational indicators.

Abstract:

The proposed research explores the relevance of spectral analysis as a methodology for dealing with time series data pertaining to education. Spectral analysis combines the statistical analysis of time series with the techniques of Fourier analysis. It proceeds by dividing a time series into various frequency components. Spectral analysis has proved helpful in engineering and economics in constructing stochastic time series models and for the input-output analysis of linear systems (sometimes referred to as frequency response studies).

More specifically the proposed research has four interrelated objectives: a. The construction of stochastic time series models for educational data (e.g., models for college enrollment, high school dropouts, doctoral degrees awarded, etc.). b. Development of more adequate methods for predicting future values of educational time series (e.g., mean years education attained, continuation ratios, percentage completing high school, etc. predicted on a yearly basis between 1975-1990). c. Estimating the impact of attempted interventions into the educational process such as the G.I. Bill. d. Using spectral theory to develop an input-output analysis of the educational system or portions thereof. This entails treating educational institutions as linear systems, interpreting the input as a human population with certain social characteristics, and interpreting the output as a human population with somewhat different social characteristics.

Discussion:

Mayer elaborated on the application of spectral analysis to educational problems, noting both its advantages and probable limitations.

Investigator: David R. Segal

Project Title: Higher education as a factor in labor force mobility.

Abstract:

Educational institutions have long been recognized as playing a role in occupational mobility by screening and training people to occupy positions of varying skill requirements in the labor force. The proposed research, based on secondary analysis of survey data and admissions and outplacement data of institutions of higher education, will attempt to assess the geographical dimension of this mobility by measuring the degree to which the labor force is redistributed through (a) movement from hometown to college or university and (b) movement from college or university to first subsequent job. In addition to helping estimate labor mobility parameters, it is expected that the study will enable us to estimate the cost or benefit to a state that attracts nonresidents to its institutions of higher education and underwrites, through tax dollars, a considerable proportion of their educational expenses.

Discussion:

The research design is complex and calls for an equally complex set of data. Questions were raised about the difficulty that might be encountered if forced to rely upon the records of college placement offices, how to treat transfer students in the model, how to handle different admission standards for in- and out-of-state students, plus the complications that might arise from institutional prestige differentials, different admissions policies at the graduate and undergraduate levels, and the possibility of obtaining quite different results depending upon whether the state is a heavy importer or exporter of trained talent.

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Today, there are numerous organizations across the country involved in the implementation and conduct of educational research. Much of this work is largely sociological in nature, but few sociologists appear to be involved. The agencies doing the work are of several kinds. Some, like the regional laboratories, are directly sponsored and supported by the U.S. Office of Education; some, such as the Educational Testing Service, operate as private (but non-profit) associations; while others are mostly university-based institutes and centers, such as the National Opinion Research Center located at the University of Chicago. Representatives of a few of these organizations were invited to the workshop to describe the nature of their programs and some of the research opportunities now available to sociologists.

Educational Testing Service

Junius A. Davis, representing ETS, began with a historical sketch of his organization, including a candid appraisal of its research activities over the past two decades. Originally interested almost solely in discipline-oriented research on tests and measurement, research at ETS in recent years has become more problem-oriented. Blending personnel from several disciplines with both basic and applied interests, ETS is an active bidder for a large range of research services. Like other "institutes," it offers researchers the advantages of continuity and stability in their work, an interdisciplinary or team approach to the solution of problems, and access to its clients, i.e., our nation's schools and colleges.

Davis provided everyone at the workshop with a document entitled Research at ETS: Projects and Publications, which describes over 200 ongoing

research projects at ETS. While largely reflecting its continuing commitment to basic research in psychological studies, the report also describes research dealing with the home environment and educational development, individual and group decision-making, prosocial behavior and conformity, contextual effects in school and college, organizational structures and innovation in education, student and college characteristics, and several studies on cultural diversity and the disadvantaged.

National Opinion Research Center

Representing NORC, Joe Spaeth spoke about the development of the Center. Established in the late 1940's, research in higher education has been one of NORC's primary concerns. The major part of this work has involved conducting field studies for a broad clientele, representing both public and private agencies.

Spaeth's own earlier studies at NORC dealt with career choice. Later, his interests shifted to the area of occupational achievement among college graduates, and currently his work deals with the development of testing procedures for evaluating colleges. Spaeth's presentation was followed by questions about some of the current longitudinal studies at NORC and problems related to the establishment of data banks.

American Institutes for Research

Speaking on behalf of the American Institutes for Research, John Claudy described the Project TALENT Data Bank located in Palo Alto, California. Available to the general research community, the original data collected in 1960 include information on the abilities, interests, plans,

activities, and background of over 400,000 students enrolled in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 in a representative sample of U.S. high schools. Follow-up questionnaires have been or will be mailed at prescribed intervals for each class, i.e., one year, five years, 10 years and 20 years after graduation.

Claudy distributed to each workshop member a variety of TALENT reports, samples of the follow-up questionnaires, and a description of over 100 research projects where the Data Bank had been utilized by investigators over the past several years. It is interesting to note that while a majority of the projects in this list have a distinctly sociological flavor, less than 10 per cent of the users have been sociologists.

The procedures that investigators might follow in utilizing the Data Bank were discussed at some length. Although special working tapes sometimes can be prepared for the investigator, most projects are handled by asking the researcher to specify the exact analysis to be undertaken. AIR then does the computer work and sends the researcher a printout of the results. The average project of this type costs about $1,500 and usually takes from two to four weeks to complete. Considering the very broad scope of the sample, the longitudinal design of the study, and the nature of the materials already available in the Data Bank, several of the consultants strongly urged sociologists to take advantage of this excellent data resource.

CONTRIBUTED PAPERS

Socialization and Personality in Education: A View from Social Psychology

Glen H. Elder, Jr.
University of North Carolina

The social psychology of education covers a broad range of problems, but its distinctive characteristic is the focus on relations between the student and social groups. Three sets of variables are of interest: properties of the group, of the individual, and of cross-level relationships. For a variety of reasons, we have not been successful in keeping all three units in focus. Part of this difficulty is our inability to think consistently and simultaneously in terms of both sociological and psychological frames of reference, coupled with disciplinary training that favors the group or individual in the social-psychological perspective we employ. This tendency commonly results in a sociologistic interpretation of student personality or in a psychological interpretation of school social-systems.

We are inclined to view social processes that link the student and social groups from either a psychological or sociological frame of reference. In the area of learning, the sociologist tends to investigate the conditions in which social factors have an impact on school performance, while the psychological emphasis appears in a focus on the internal mechanisms by which the individual responds to and assimilates stimuli of various kinds. These dual frames of reference are most evident when we are dealing with relations between macro-structures and individual behavior.

As a dynamic link between the social system and individual, the socialization process is a logical meeting ground for approaches from sociology

and psychology. From Durkheim's early work on moral education to the present, socialization and systematic education have been used interchangeably to refer to the process by which individuals become members of social groups and selectively acquire commitments and competencies for appropriate social action and role enactment.

Socialization in the schools may be studied in terms of its consequences for the individual and social system, but it is always embedded in social situations and in an institutional network, is structured in relation to particular social groups (classrooms, informal peer groups, etc.), whether ongoing or emerging, and involves socio-cultural content. Within a broader context, the individual student is a participating member of multiple groups, each with its own goals, demands, and universe of discourse which may conflict with those of other groups. Intergroup conflicts and exchange are an important source of sociocultural change and challenge the simplistic view that equates socialization with culture transmission and generational replication.

In the time alotted I would like to explore the educational implications of viewing student socialization as a process. I shall begin by identifying some features of socialization and their neglect in educational research. This is followed by a brief discussion of interaction between student and school environment, and of selected problems in student socialization.

The Nature of Socialization as Reflected in Educational Research

The assumption that the socialization process is a major concern of social psychologists in the field of education is not strongly supported by actual research. For example:

1. Socialization is an interactional process, yet few studies have actually investigated this process. We tend to have a good deal of interest in social processes, since they provide the basis for explaining outcomes, yet our designs limit us mainly to inferences. Age group data are of dubious value for drawing conclusions about processes, personal and social -- see for example studies of political socialization in the schools and other age trend studies. Fine-grained longitudinal studies are needed. These should include microscopic studies strategically focused on critical phases of the educational process, such as entry and departure from a social group.

2. Socialization is a transactional process, in contrast to the traditional conception, an asymmetric, uni-directional model. In causal language, it is non-recursive.

This means that the relationship between student and teacher is a context for student and teacher socialization, for adolescent as well as adult socialization. Sub-division of the field of education or socialization into age-grades tends to minimize this emphasis, as does the language of theory and research: stimulus-response, agent of socialization, and recursive, causal models.

Socialization has interrelated consequences for the individual and social system, yet few studies have actually focused on both sides of the relationship. In part, this is due to fundamentally different views of socialization. This point can be illustrated by reference to Talcott Parsons' writings. In some of his work, socialization is viewed from the learning perspective of the individual, while his essays on the school tend to conceive of socialization as an allocative process. Each of these perspectives generate a different set of questions and implications. As an example, note Benjamin Bloom's provocative essay on "Mastery for Learning" which assumes that most, if not all, children can master basic skills and knowledge if given enough time and practice. The essay takes a learning perspective and fails to consider the different performance demands and criteria in society with their consequences for discontinuity between school and future roles.

Research on socialization in the schools and innovations are increasingly reflecting a conception of the learner as an active, innovative agent. Developments in linguistics and in the field of cognitive development are largely instrumental in this change from a passive concept of the organism.

Degree of Congruence Between the School Environment and Student Personality

In theories of socialization and development, an important source of personal change is a discrepancy between the environment, however operationalized, and personality. This problem of fit or match is a recurring theme in the literature on development and education, and presents an array of conceptual and measurement problems. The developmentalists -- Bruner, Hunt, Langer, Piaget, etc. -- describe this discrepancy in terms of disequilibration processes. Interactionists in sociology tend to view the problem of match in terms of the relation between self and role set; personal change is hypothesized as a consequence of changing role sets.

The problem of fit or match can be interpreted as a general theoretical problem involving socialization as a transactional process linking environment and personality. It is thus a problem in cross-level theorizing, and as Mike Hannan has pointed out, we have not been notably successful on this task. If we are to successfully integrate social system and personality foci in a theoretic framework for socialization, we need a general paradigm that maintains their integrity, minimizes terminological and conceptual variations across disciplinary boundaries, and centers on the processual aspects of inter-system transactions. One effort along this line is Rosabeth Kanter's study of commitment and social organization.

In the field of education, three studies in particular illustrate the problem of match: All three investigated the relation between student

characteristics and characteristics of the college environment, with emphasis on its behavioral consequences. Little attention is given to socialization.

1. Stern's well known study of authoritarian students at the University of Chicago. Authoritarians were disproportionately represented among the drop-outs.

2. Feldman and Newcomb's review of research on college students (1969) made two tentative conclusions that bear upon the fit problem.
   a. the accentuation of initial student characteristics through reinforcement, etc.
   b. personal change is a curvilinear function of the relation between initial student characteristics and characteristics of college environment. Some discrepancy is needed to produce personal change; large discrepancy increases prospects of dropping out, withdrawal, etc.

3. Davis' study, entitled "The Campus as a Frogpond," raises a host of questions concerning the nature of the fit between personality and environment, and the consequences of talent congruence in highly selective colleges.

These and other studies raise provocative questions concerning person-environment relations, but they leave unresolved an array of questions on their conceptualization and measurement. What do we mean when we say that some discrepancy between person and environment or role is required to produce change? How much of a difference and how does it occur? If we use a general system model of personality and social system, would we expect different consequences from incongruence between parallel and non-parallel aspects of each system?

Some Unknowns and Problems in Student Socialization

Though socialization of intellectual and interpersonal skills is a primary goal of schools, the process by which this development occurs is largely unexplored. Many examples could be given, and I have chosen only a select set that reflects some of my own research and theoretical interests.

1. Status transitions and socialization into school or classroom as a strategic area for research.

Making it in school, to use Boocock's term, depends in large measure on how and to what extent the child becomes an accepted member of the student community. Despite all of the talk among educators about the problems of orienting new students, there is barely one solid study in the literature that has examined socialization into school or student social systems within a longitudinal design. This process would involve variations in:

a. preparation for new status within former school setting.

b. degree of fit between student characteristics and attributes of new setting.

c. available coaches and coaching in the transition.

d. induction into the new system through informal groups of classmates. What accounts for variations in socialization progress? Cognitive, affective, and normative commitments are important dependent variables.

Status transitions between schools are a strategic point at which to study socialization and personality processes. This has become increasingly clear to me in some of my current research.

2. Change in student commitments during the school career, and factors that account for these changes.

Cross-sectional studies have found that student commitments to parents are high, relative to identification with peers, during the initial years of school, reach a low level in the middle years, and increase in the last year for youth in high school. However, it is apparent that comparisons across age groups cannot substitute for a longitudinal sample (see prisonization studies).

3. The consequences of student stratification on ability, performance, or social adjustment for socialization and personality.

Hundreds of studies on streaming, most of shoddy quality, have added up to a large question mark on the educational value of this procedure. Many intriguing unknowns remain, owing to:

a. the relative lack of studies on social psychological processes within and between streams.

b. the need for an empirically grounded model of status allocation and social processes.

Is there a "frogpond" effect on gifted students who are grouped together and evaluated in relation to each other?

Why do European studies show consistently more negative effects of low placement and more positive effects of high placement than American studies?

4. Transactional processes in teacher-student and student-student relations.

These processes include an array of unexplored problems, although some progress has been achieved in this direction as a result of improvements in measurement -- rating scales and videotape technology. In the student-teacher context, one of the striking neglects of processual data is seen in Rosenthal's Pygmaleon study. Dusek's study of expectancy effects promises to get at process, and will also explore the effects of conditions that increase or decrease a student's dependency on the teacher.

If I were to draw one conclusion from research on classroom units, a leading candidate would be the concentration of studies on relations between student and teacher. A great deal of work needs to be done on student teaching, relations between students, and intergroup relations. Most of the best research at present has not been conducted in the classroom.

5. The relation between subcultural orientations and student subcommunities. How are the cultural and associational related in the student body over time?

Though we assume that shared perspectives are generated out of common situations and interaction, few studies have systematically investigated the relation between culture and association. The well-known Trow and Clark typology is a meager beginning at best.

6. Assessing and explaining school outcomes.

The key problem here is whether schools make a difference in the development of students. While there is currently a good deal of theoretical and practical interest in the assessment of school outcomes, the finding are compromised by design problems and are narrowly restricted to traditional indices of student achievement. As implied by my previous comments, even less is known about the process by which certain outcomes are achieved.

There are two appraoches that might be employed in the assessment of school effects. One would compare the performance of students in different schools to determine whether the school attended by children makes a difference in their learning and performance. Most research on school outcomes has investigated the between-school effects on student achievement within a cross-sectional design. While these effects appear to be uniformly small, when compared to within-school effects, an adequate assessment requires a control on student input in a comparative, longitudinal design. This type of design is extremely rare. For example, only one study comes even close to a before-after design in research on desegregation and student performance.

The other approach would compare the development of children who are enrolled in schools with children who are receiving their education in the home through correspondence programs, etc. Research in Australia and in

western Canada is currently exploring the effects of schooling within this type of design.

The most perplexing problem in the assessment of school outcomes centers on the identification of common educational goals. The appraisal of means and outcomes obviously depends upon knowledge of these goals.

7. The investigation of school effects on family socialization.

The traditional approach to transactions between family and school has been to assess family effects on school performance. Another important set of problems centers on the effects of formal education on family socialization. While a growing body of research has explored the role of education in status attainment with its effects on family life in the next generation, very little is known about the effects of parent participation in Headstart or other preschool programs on socialization within the family. What are the consequences of adult education on the self-image, generational relations, and socialization practices of parents in the familial context?

General Conclusions

The brevity of this session has not permitted me to do justice to the issues I have raised, but we shall have the opportunity to elaborate upon them in subsequent discussions. The key point of my presentation is that systematic education or socialization is a social process that links the individual with groups or social structures. In order to understand education as process, we need to employ methodologies and theories that sensitize us to interpersonal transactions, in addition to properties of the individual and group. Interactionist theory in sociology has much to offer in this respect, but it is only a mere beginning.

On the Significance of Educational Organizations

Ronald G. Corwin
The Ohio State University

How can the study of schools and colleges contribute to sociological theory (Bidwell, 1965; Corwin, 1967; Katz, 1964)? They have several organizational properties which are shared with other types of organizations, but are sufficiently unique to extend the range of theory pertaining to complex organizations. The following characteristics are not intended to be exhaustive, but to serve as illustrations for some promising lines of inquiry:

(1) They are a species of bureaucratic people-processing organizations which exhibit some of the characteristics of total institutions; they exemplify the tension and accommodations between family and bureaucratic systems; in this regard in the public schools, recruitment of personnel cannot be directly controlled by either the clientele or the organization, although both parties have evoked strategies of indirect control; at the same time there is variability between pre-school and college settings; schools, therefore, provide a strategic place to identify the factors which give clients differential control over and access to service organizations, one of the fundamental problems of a post-industrial society.

(2) A relatively uniform reward and control structure must be reconciled with heterogeneous clientele (student bodies); this situation provides opportunities to observe the consequences from degrees of dissimilarity between organizational and client characteristics, for example, to observe the process of goal adaptation, variable rule enforcement, and the rise of informal specialization within and among schools based on mixtures of custodial and treatment procedures, and differences in emphasis on cognitive achievement and moral and behavioral conformity.

(3) Bureaucratic norms must be accommodated (a) to the primary group characteristics of students and the family system, and (b) to professional norms of an occupation in the process of mobility; a historical dialectic between centralization and decentralization which has produced shifting balances of power between clients, professionals and administrators, provides opportunities to study these accommodation processes and their consequences for the organization and the client.

(4) Internal differentiation on the basis of various combinations of age, meritocracy, and social class provides opportunities to observe how ascribed and achieved statuses are compromised and otherwise mediated by organizational structures: almost universal age grading practices, combined with latent social class influences, highlights the influences of peer groups; and this provides opportunities to observe how the combined impact of organizational structure and peer group influences reward structures and outcomes.

(5) Schools and colleges have similar structural properties throughout the world -- e.g., level of training of personnel, internal differentiation, and control procedures; yet there is sufficient variability along specific dimensions, as well as in structural profiles, to provide meaningful cross-national comparisons.

(6) As national institutions, schools and colleges are imbedded in a complex network of local and national organizations, which makes them convenient points from which to observe the interplay among organizations and their environments; for example, the direct and indirect influences of accrediting agencies, federal agencies, college admission policies on organizational structures of local schools can be examined for schools controlled and financed in different ways at the local level.

(7) Current public pressures and a climate for innovation in education provide a natural laboratory for the study of planned organizational change; major experiments underway in the United States, Europe, and Japan reflect implicit theories of innovation reported in the sociological literature (e.g., the replacement, socialization, diffusion and power equalization approaches); these experiments provide unprecedented efforts to systematically manipulate precisely those major structural variables of interest to sociologists, for example:

Attempts at decentralization and community control;

The alternative school's movement and voucher education;

New forms of pre-schools and community school centers, including informal schools in England and the United States;

Performance contracting based on an accountability system;

Educational parks;

New models of teacher education for teaching in low income areas, including modular procedures and apprenticing teachers to work in local schools and their communities;

Attempts to recruit teachers from non-traditional sources, such as from minority groups and from the liberal arts;

The development of new roles, including quasi-professional roles, which use indigenous members of the community, and patterns of differentiated staffing, such as team teaching and cross-age tutoring, and new relationships between the teachers and their communities.

The following comments will attempt to show how some of these characteristics are relevant to key issues in sociology.

General Propositions

Two propositions, which are implicit in research on people processing organizations, provide necessary points of departure for further research in

this field. While these propositions could be used as the basis for a series of deductive propositions, given space considerations, systematic theory will not be pursued here. Instead, this discussion will be limited to a few conceptual problems that must be resolved before research on these problems can be advanced.

Contextual Effects

The first proposition is that the structural and compositional properties of schools and colleges influence their output, and that the influence is at least as significant as the personal backgrounds of individuals. While this statement minimizes the interaction effect which probably exists between these two dimensions, it is stated so as to underscore a larger debate in the field: between a reductionist camp that would reduce explanations to demographic characteristics of individuals, and those sociologists who assume that the structural context and the composition of the organization have independent effects on organizational outcomes.

A number of well known studies have demonstrated a relationship between "years of schooling" and later income and occupational status, and more recently years of schooling has been found to be associated with "modern" values held by the individual. But conceptually, what is "years of schooling"? Inkeles (1969) proposes that more is involved than exposure to a given type of curriculum, and suggests that characteristics of schools have independent effects. In support of this contention, it has been observed that the cumulative deficit experienced by lower class children as they go through the schools would suggest that schools have a negative impact (although changes in the family structure during maturation cannot be ruled out). Also, rebellion in the schools (Stinchcombe, 1964), and the disproportionate rate of

dropout customarily are attributed to the child's personal characteristics, because the school is usually taken as a given; but one could ask what characteristics of the schools push out certain types of clients.[1] This again raises the broader question of the access of clients to service organizations in a post-industrial society.

Nevertheless, some writers dispute that school characteristics have even an intervening influence on school outcomes. Armer and Youtz (1971) believe that the curriculum and not the type of school accounted for the modernizing influence of schooling in Nigeria. The "Coleman Report" (1966) is often cited for evidence that "school characteristics are unrelated to academic achievement." Parallel conclusions have been reached about higher education (Astin, 1968) [although Barton's (1968) critique questions the way research usually has been formulated].

The weight of the evidence at this point suggests that school characteristics have relatively small, but persistent effects. Before accepting this conclusion, however, it is advisable to consider the nature of the evidence. There have been several difficulties in this research to date.

Arbitrary Choice of Indicators. The indicators of organizational structure used to date have been selected on the basis of common sense or pragmatic criteria rather than on the basis of theory. Hence, there is little correspondence between the indicators of organizational structure in the research and the dimensions emphasized in the theoretical literature. The "Coleman Report" and Project Talent rely on such indicators as school facilities, class size, etc., with no attempt to tap the central components of any complex organization, such as:

---

[1]Perhaps theoretically the independent variable should be formulated as the dissimilarity in the relationship between the client and organization.

1. The control structure, including the degree of centralization and decentralization; there is a body of research suggesting, for example, that the ability of organizations to adapt to local variabilities and their openness or closure to community influences is influenced by decentralization (Terreberry, 1965; Turk, 1970).

2. The reward system, the significance of which was emphasized by several writers (Becker, 1953; Hodgkins and Herriott, 1970); the fact that teachers are rewarded for the cognitive achievement and behavioral conformity of their pupils produces a distinct pattern of mobility and self-selection among teachers and produces disparities between student and teacher expectations; similarly, theory suggests that the degree of competition among children for grades, and the extent to which children from different social classes find grades a meaningful award, are important variables.

3. Grouping practices, including their influence on the peer group structure; the single-item indicator included in the Coleman Report is too simple to tap the complexity of this form of differentiation (Sorenson, 1970), and more generally, the informal organizational setting has been given scant attention, for example, the internal variability among different peer groups within schools and colleges (Barton, 1968), and the influence of the dominance of the sports culture [which Coleman (1961) himself emphasized in another study].

Preoccupation with Typical Schools. Another criticism is that linear correlational analysis is an inappropriate technique for identifying the influence of organizational structure, since the extremes are obscured and washed out by small variations within the middle range. The crucial test will have to focus on the differences between so-called innovative schools and typical schools. Similarly, the correlation technique does not adequately separate community from school influence, which in most cases, are highly correlated. Deviant case analysis would be a more appropriate way to separate these two dimensions.

Simplistic Criteria of Outcomes. Sociologists are typically alert to the variability of outcomes of organizations and in particular, to their latent consequences. It is therefore disappointing that in both the Coleman

Report and the International Study of Mathematics cognitive achievement is the only criterion of school effects considered.

The mobility literature does go beyond cognitive measure by relating schooling to occupational placement. However, as sophisticated and important as that literature is, it nevertheless reflects an extreme economic and middleclass bias toward mobility within the economic system. Social mobility is not the only important outcome which reasonably could be expected of educational organizations. This is not a question of policy, but reflects a basic problem of conceptualizing organizational outcomes in such a way as to identify patterns of direct and latent consequences.

Therefore, for future work, the correlation between social class, schooling and mobility seems theoretically less important than the unexplained variance, which includes large proportions of children at any educational level for whom occupational mobility is not relevant. What do schools do to and for them, and their future life style -- i.e., their political participation (Hess and Torney, 1967), initiative and compliance predispositions, and their use of leisure time?

Exaggeration of Negative Findings. Perhaps one of the most serious shortcomings in this literature has been the tendency to ignore the persistence of school affects which, despite the theoretical and methodological problems, have shown up in study after study (Crain, 1971; McDill, et.al., 1967, 1968; Nasater, 1968; Rehberg and Shaeffer, 1968; Scott and Ed-Assal, 1969; Wallace, 1964; Wilson, 1959). The conclusions of the authors of the Coleman Report notwithstanding, their data do show that some school characteristics make a difference: that the difference is larger for lower class children than for those in middle class schools suggests an interaction between school affects and characteristics of the children. Moreover, a

series of studies including the Coleman Report, Project Talent, Mallenkopf and Melville's Study, Goodman's Study, the Plowden Report and other studies [some of which have been reviewed by Dyer (1969)] have found several characteristics associated with academic achievement, e.g.: peer group composition, characteristics of teachers (education, race, experience, verbal ability, attitudes toward integration), salary of teachers, composition of the curriculum (including matematics offering), cost per pupil, number of specialists on the staff, urbanism and geographic location.

In view of the problems already identified, the fact that these variables do not explain large amounts of variance is probably less important than the fact that -- even with the problems -- structural effects do show up.

Mediating Roles of Schools

Thus far, the discussion has been limited to a consideration of the internal dimensions of organizational theory. The second proposition is that the structural and compositional characteristics link and otherwise mediate societal level events with interpersonal processes. This linkage role has become increasingly salient in the literature over the past five years. A subtle shift in emphasis can be observed in the study of the schools and colleges as complex, bureaucratic organizations to a focus on outside influences imported into the school by students and teachers, including the peer group influence and the impact of professionalization, and more recently deprofessionalization. Still more recently this focus has been shifting even more directly to the interplay between schools and other environments, in accord with a general tendency in the literature on organizations. For example, Litwak and Hylton (1962) suggested that a systematic

"balance" theory is needed to account for the variety of mechanisms used by schools to regulate their relationship with families.

These developments have made it clear that convention definitions of organization are not entirely adequate to handle organization-environment relations and call for a re-conceptualization of organizations. In particular, organizational boundaries require more attention. Rather than viewing boundaries as a simple dichotomy, primary and secondary boundaries can be viewed as a set of variables relating to the dimensions of containment and permeability (Corwin, 1967).

The Influence of Environment on Internal Characteristics of Schools. Some attention has been given to the conditions under which schools became more or less bureaucratic and the consequences of bureaucratization. Evidence reported by Corwin (1970) suggested that bureaucratic structures tend to become consistent and crystallized in turbulent environments, and remain uncrystallized in non-turbulent ones. This finding has implications for the relative power of reinforcement and compensatory models of organization.

Another type of question concerns the influence of characteristics of the economic political system on school system characteristics; e.g., do nations in which government is centralized try to monopolize formal education through centralizing state-supported school systems, and do schools tend to become decentralized in multi-lingual nations or other nations in which there are basic cleavages (Coleman, 1965; Herriott and Hodgkins, 1969).

The Influence of Schools on Their Environments. Schools also can be viewed as active agents, and in particular as arenas where normative conflicts in the society are resolved, and as mediators between rapid social change and the social structure. In this connection, more needs to be known about the role of school structures in helping to fragment or to unify a

society (Havighurst, 1968). Do comprehensive schools help to homogenize the society as Conant proposed, and does the existence of specialized schools based on meritocracy promote cleavages among groups?[2]

More needs to be known also about the role which school organization plays in promoting or blocking change in educational systems in modern and modernizing nations. Clark's (1965) essay on the introduction of new math in this country pointed to the importance of lateral decision making and a division of labor among a variety of organizations ranging from groups of professors and textbook publishers to the U.S. Office of Education in another study. Corwin (forthcoming) found that (1) technological innovation in 42 schools in different regions of the country was positively associated with the modernization of the state in which the school was located, as well as certain characteristics of schools themselves; (2) when liberal, change-oriented graduates from liberal arts colleges were deliberately introduced as "change agents," in schools in the largest cities, there was an inverse correlation between their presence and the number of changes that occurred; (3) but in the least modernized regions (e.g., the rural South), where innovation was generally less probable, the presence of change-oriented interns was positively associated with the amount of change. The data suggested that the defense of schools in the former areas could be traced to a centralized administration, strong teacher organizations, and specialized competence of teachers, which were less characteristic of schools in smaller,

---

[2]It is ironic that the first documented studies of the adverse affects of schools on lower class pupils were conducted in relatively small towns where students were integrated by social class, whereas more recently there is evidence that such integration promotes academic achievement. The conditions under which integration does and does not improve achievement are still not known. Again, organizational and contextural properties of these situations must be examined.

less modernized regions. Teachers in these latter regions relied for their defense on traditional, conservative value patterns, referred to by Parsons as "fundamentalism." While fundamentalistic values helped to protect these schools from rapid change, they did not seem to be as effective against change-oriented outsiders in their midst as were the structural defenses available to schools in other parts of the country.

Opportunities for research on change are also illustrated in the alternative schools movement and in performance contracting experiments, both of which have the effect of transforming schools from "domesticated" to wild, competitive organizations. These experiments provide the opportunity to examine whether the existence of competitive schools in the private domain will force public schools to make structural changes and to observe the evolution of symbiotic patterns and specialization among alternative schools competing for clientele.

Obstacles to Research

Finally, before further advances can be made on these issues, it will be necessary to overcome several obstacles which have confronted research on organizations, including the following.

1. First, research in this field has been hampered by the necessarily crude measures of complex concepts. A contributing factor has been the misplaced attempts to apply procedures developed for large scale samples of individuals to complex social settings. It has been necessary to work with samples that are "neither fish nor fowl," i.e., small enough to include important dimensions of complexity, and yet typically not large enough to meet the assumptions of available statistical models.

2. Work in the area has been hampered by the lack of useful typology for classifying organizations in such a way that findings can be generalized from one organizational setting to another (Corwin, 1967). Too frequently schools have been

studied in isolation from some other organizations representing other institutional sectors -- business organizations, churches, service agencies, etc. As a result, research on other types of organization has been applied haphazardly to schools, and more importantly, implications of research on schools for organizational theory is at best uncertain and tenuous.

3. Finally, more cross-national research on schools and colleges as complex organizations is needed, not only to maximize variance but to test for the universality of structural effects.

Selected References

Armer, Michael and Robert Youtz, "Formal Education and Individual Modernity in an African Society," American Journal of Sociology, 76 (January, 1971), pp. 604-626.

Astin, Alexander W., "Undergraduate Achievement and Institutional Excellence," Science, 161 (August 16, 1968), pp. 661-668.

Barton, Allen, "Studying the Effects of College Education," in The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis, Karen Yamamoto, ed., Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.

Becker, Howard S., "Social Class Variations in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship," Journal of Educational Sociology, 25 (April, 1952), p. 469.

Bidwell, Charles E., "The School as a Formal Organization," in Handbook of Organizations, James G. March, ed., Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, Chapter 23, pp. 972-1022.

Clark, Burton R., "Interorganizational Patterns in Education," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (September, 1965), pp. 224-237.

Coleman, James S., Education and Political Development, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Coleman, James, The Adolescent Society, New York: The Free Press, 1961.

----------, et. al., Equal Educational Opportunity Survey, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Corwin, Ronald G., "Education and the Sociology of Complex Organizations," in Donald Hansen and Joel Gerstl, eds., On Education: Sociological Perspectives, New York: Wiley & Sons, 1967.

----------, Militant Professionalism: A Study of Bureaucratic Conflict in High Schools, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

----------, "Organizational Structure and Educational Innovation in More and Less Modernized, Urbanized Regions of the United States: Some Directions for Cross-National Research," forthcoming.

Crain, Robert L., "School Integration and the Academic Achievement of Negroes," Sociology of Education, 44 (Winter, 1971), pp. 1-26.

Dyer, Henry S., "School Factors," Harvard Educational Review, 38 (Winter, 1969), pp. 38-56.

Havighurst, Robert J., ed., Comparative Perspectives on Education, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968.

Herriott, Robert E. and Benjamin Hodgkins, "Sociocultural Context and the American School: An Open Systems Analysis of Educational Opportunity," Center for the Study of Education, Florida State University, January, 1969.

Hess, R. D. and J. V. Torney, "The Development of Political Attitudes in Children," Chicago: Aldine Press, 1967.

Hodgkins, Benjamin and Robert Herriott, "Age-Grade Structure, Goals and Compliance in the School: An Organizational Analysis," Sociology of Education, 43 (Winter, 1970), pp. 90-104.

Inkeles, Alex, "Making Man Modern," American Journal of Sociology, 75, (September, 1969), pp. 208-225.

Katz, Fred E., "The School as a Complex Social Organization," Harvard Educational Review, 34 (Summer, 1964), pp. 428-455.

Litwak, Eugene and Lydia Hylton, "Inter-Organization Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6 (March, 1962).

McDill, Edward L., et. al., "Institutional Effects on the Academic Behavior of High School Students," Sociology of Education, 40 (Summer, 1967), pp. 181-199.

----------, "Educational Climates of High Schools: Their Effects and Sources," American Journal of Sociology, 74 (May, 1968), pp. 567-586.

Nasater, David, "A Note on Contextural Effects and the Political Orientation of University Students," American Sociological Review, 33 (April, 1968), pp. 210-219.

Rehberg, Richard A., and Richard E. Shaeffer, "Participation in Inter-Scholastic Athletics and College Expectations," American Journal of Sociology, 73 (May, 1968), pp. 732-740.

Scott, Joseph and Mohamed Ed-Assal, "Multi-Versity, University Size, University Quality and Student Protest: An Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, 34 (October, 1969), pp. 702-709.

Sorenson, Aage Bottger, "Organizational Differentiation of Students and Educational Opportunity," Sociology of Education, 43 (Fall, 1970), pp. 355-376.

Stinchcombe, Arthur, Rebellion in the High School, Quadrangle Books, 1964.

Terreberry, Shirley, "The Evolution of Administrative Environments," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (March, 1965), pp. 590-613.

Turk, Herman, "Interorganizational Networks in Urban Society: Initial Perspectives and Comparative Research," American Sociological Review, 35 (February, 1970), pp. 1-18.

Wallace, Walter L., "Institutional and Life Cycle Socialization of College Freshmen," American Journal of Sociology, 70 (November, 1964), pp. 303-318.

Wilson, Alan B., "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 836-845.

Salient Themes in Theory and Research on The Sociology of Education

C. Arnold Anderson
University of Chicago

In its original form this paper was a detailed topical outline designed to stimulate discussion among a group of recent post-doctoral grantees. Some license for oversimplification was preempted in order to better stimulate the clear emergence of basic issues. Apart from the particular theoretical or methodological, not to mention ideological, biases of the writer, the intent here is to provide a coherent point of view rather than a representative selection from points of view to be found among the regular contributors to the scholarly literature in this field. No effort has been made to supply bibliographic citations. After the seminar ended, the outline was written out in full textual form; it has now been recast in somewhat different order though without major change in emphases. The discussion is organized around a dozen themes or dicta.

1. "Educational Distributions" Are Important Characteristics of Social Collectivities

Over a century ago, both observers of foreign educational systems and the political arithmeticians were trying to create dependable numerical pictures of the state of education in various countries, cities, or social strata. About a century later the United States in 1940 initiated the collection and publication of data (cross-classified by many variables) on the years of schooling attained by members of the population. This practice now is spreading rapidly among the world's statistical organizations. The older as well as the more recent statisticians have learned how to use the

distribution of schooling as an important characterization of a society or of its subpopulations -- and one that is comparatively amenable to internation comparisons. Not only median levels of schooling but also various indexes, crude though the data may be. Profiting from earlier work by economists working on income distributions, assorted measurements of "inequality" have permitted us also to link "schooling" with other indexes of social status as well as to use its distribution to objectively characterize intra-societal differentiation. In short, a whole broad area of "social indicators" is being opened to exploration. While social scientists tend to fall into one of two groups -- seeing education as a "loosener" of stratification systems or alternatively as a bulwark of them -- a sensitive use of information about the distribution of education (or its close correlates such as literacy) is rapidly shifting most of the debates about stratification from "either-or" to "how much" terms. A striking example has been the opportunity to turn disputes about "the disadvantaged" away from the path that leads only to reifications of sentimental shibboleths into a better-focused dispute about data rather than about ideological predilections.

2. Sociologists of Education Have Delayed Too Long in Taking Economics Seriously

The economist's contribution to the sociology of education need not be limited to loaning a few statistical indicators. Economists are particularly interested in establishing the "outcome" or "payoff" from education in quantitative terms. Using their "theory of the firm" they are interested also in developing "production functions" for classrooms or schools by which the ratio between outputs and inputs can be grounded firmly in hard data. Yet nothing the economists have been trying to do is confined to "material,"

"monetary," or "production" approaches to assessment of how educational systems work. In fact it was by relying upon a solid intellectual tradition in micro-economics (such as the theory of the firm) that the aura of prestige surrounding economics has led to the more rapid expansion of data to strengthen the investigations of sociologists. Thus, in contrast to "the national assessment" of learning that is being carried out, economists can disaggregate their data down to individual firms. It will be a day for celebration when we sociologists will possess micro data about socialization suitable for linking to the data used in economists' studies of "human capital."

No less important is the traditional economists' concern about the incidence of private and public benefits and costs. Many features of the crises in metropolitan schools arise from societal failure to devise a dependable technique for making sure that a public service is paid for by the beneficiary rather than the cost loaded off onto other persons -- except where that be the intent, as in "welfare" remedial policies. Joint work in this area by sociologists, economists, and political scientists could be enormously productive, and some of the new specialists in law would be active partners. Not that the economists' work has a special importance transcending that of other scholars, but economists are more likely to ask concrete questions about controversial issues. If collaboration with them can lead to innovations of ways by which individuals (and not their representatives several times removed in our many-tiered polity) learn to respond to economic signals, the analyses by each discipline of education will be the more fruitful.

Various corollaries can be drawn from the foregoing remarks. If only by virtue of its cost in dollars and in years of each life, schooling must cease to be treated as a free good and more attention must be devoted to

devising ways by which individuals may make educational decisions for themselves or their wards more astutely. Obviously, such attractive phrases as "equality of educational opportunity" need more scrutiny exegetically in order that we can design more pertinent ways to assess the outcomes of chosen social policies. For example, equality for the poor versus the rich among the most able tenth of a cohort is quite different than equality between the more and the less able in the cohort at large. We need to ask more persistently how much it is worth to a society (by agreed criteria) to raise median performance in school by, say, ten percent, or to reduce or widen the dispersion in performance among a cohort of pupils, or to shift the skewness from the high to the low end of the distribution. It is in such definite and concrete terms that major "problems" of education must be evaluated, whether in a normative or in a positive context.

3. "Problems" of Education Are As Much Scale Effects as Qualitative Deficiencies

Rising rates of attendance at schools of successively higher level has been one of the most dynamic features in every "advanced" society. Not only are teachers commonly the most populous occupation (at least outside agriculture); several societies are approaching a condition in which the typical individual will spend the majority of his life in various sorts of schooling or organized training. While the median schooling has been rising, whether in response to economic inducements or merely fashionable pressures to remain in school, the dispersion of medians among subpopulations remains large in every society.

The other affluent societies are rapidly emulating the practices of the United States in this regard, and even some of the poorest societies

have put their prestige to the test of this criterion. We in the United States are prone to assert that "there is a college for every youth who wishes to attend." But of course we all know that youth sort themselves (and are sorted) among colleges according to sex, family background, academic ability, spatial accessibility, and other factors. Whether one could justly say that we have "a system of higher education" is debatable. But, given our constitutional heritage, there are complex interweavings of local loyalties, local financial support, and a preponderantly local sorting of high school graduates for college attendance. Our collective generosity in supplying "places" for students in college and our snobbishness about which college outranks these or those others reflect a determination that every individual or vocation is entitled to receive an "intellectual" stamp but reflect also a deep-seated suspicion of intellectuals.

Yet despite our rapidly diffusing "taste for education" and our high level of fiscal support for schools, the public seems not quite assured that "children learn more than they used to." We know that piling millions of former cotton-field workers into a few cities has generated an overwhelming task for the schools of those cities. We are becoming more uneasy as evidence mounts that an American pupil "typically" learns less than in comparable nations. We are discovering that a growing proportion of the typical school career is spent in what must honestly be called "remedial" years. The appearance of "reluctant students" in the most elite universities fits badly with what seems to be a public decision that proportionately more resources should be devoted to making more years of schooling "free." Our pangs of conscience about the botched "head start" programs -- that so many of us quite readily concede to have legitimate priority over "junior college" -- seemingly cannot offset the historically unique conjuncture: a sincerely

"democratic" society in which the privileged (possessors of more than secondary education) are soon to be the clear voting majority in any electoral confrontation over problems of education. In all of these situations the seemingly effective schools of our parents' day have seemed suddenly to disintegrate into parodies of "reform schools." Yet no man can stand solidly on any evidence and assert that pupils' typically learn less today than pupils of the same ability did a quarter century ago. As in problems of Malthusian famines, urban traffic, or airport congestion, it is a kind of overpopulation that we call "problems of scale" that promise to be the most recalcitrant.

4. Questions about the Quality of Schools are as Complex as Those about Systems of Delivery of All Social Services

As mentioned, the United States has been historically unique in its institutionalized encouragement of wide local differentials in standards for performance of graduates from schools. (Curiously, we would not consider for a moment extending the same permissiveness into the sphere of athletic prowess.) Our system of "accrediting" has not proved to be functionally equivalent to nationally supervised systems of examinations, but it has saved us from the stranglehold of corrupt examination systems that plague so many countries. Despite our healthy empiricism about pedagogical questions, the recent friability of our social structure has allowed these invalid national systems of examinations to creep into our schools.

While the United States has turned out our share of the world's pedagogical innovations, the extreme decentralization of our system for administering schools has allowed us to be most casual about insuring that lagging school systems be stimulated to pick up and use innovations of known

utility. Almost certainly, variance in quality among elementary and secondary schools has widened as a result -- and in turn contributed to the need for more "remedial years" spoken of above.

An "industry" so large as our system of education (yet with an extremely unstable corps of both teachers and pupils) must find ways to cope with a large proportion of inferior teachers or acquiesce in a widening diversity of accomplishment among schools and communities. As has often been shown, there is no deficiency in the number of teachers of high ability (compared to engineering or law, say), but since teaching is so populous an occupation a large percentage must be of middling capability. But when one turns from these features to discuss the quality of the work done by schools, it must be acknowledged as only fair to judge schools not in relation to the aggregate resources they expend but by the amount of resources that a school system can shift among uses. Before one too quickly claims to know how to make judgements about the relative productivity of schools, it is perhaps instructive for him to ask himself how effective he thinks churches are, or advertising (a major example of curriculum construction), or the physician-patient relationship as against other influences for better health.

And immediately one begins to discuss quality of educational service (or the efficiency of its "delivery system"), one has to balance benefits against dysfunctionalities that result from striving for "high quality" in schools or colleges. And always, as our empirical enthusiasts have shown, high quality of output from a school may have very little connection with the alleged "efficiency" of the pedagogic operation under scrutiny. "Production added" by a year of school is probably small in most cases; it certainly is hard to identify. Moreover, there is an inherent tension between the goal of quality and the populist goal of opportunity. What -- using criteria of

national productivity in industry or some other criterion -- would be an optimum spread among high schools in senior's median scores in physics? How many additional points in mathematics would (by given criteria) be traded off against how many points for adeptness in English? And then one is led into the question: should the "best" graduate or professional students be selected into the "best" schools, or would some different combination between quality of instructors and of students bring more benefit to the society? And at a lower level, to what degree should secondary schools and junior colleges be basically cognitive or affective in what they teach?

5. Methodological Obstacles to "Explaining" Educational Achievement

One principal obstacle to conclusive investigations on this topic is that each investigator has been through a particular educational system and probably now is also teaching in it. In our historical heritage, education has been touched by many aspects of "the philosophy of the enlightenment" and with associated notions about "human perfectibility," "progress," "democracy," etc. This saturation with the customs of one particular educational system and with its associated ideological penumbra, hinders our inventing more venturesome explanations of how the system operates. Most of our models, however much affected by Sorokin's or another's theory of social mobility, are rather simple modifications of Condorcet's theories about social change. Given today's powerful computers and impressive organizations for data collection, exploring the interconnections between extra-school factors or correlates of quality and quantity of schooling presents no great challenge. But there are more subtle and mainly self-constructed obstacles to obtaining a good model that can carry us beyond our present half-way point.

For one thing, the contemporary technique-minded young sociologist is often disinclined to inquire whether someone has done serious or even definitive work on his topic previously; today's academic folkways cut us off from much useful work of the past. Our proficiency in building models is hindered also by our failure to examine the operations of societal mechanisms that resemble schools. As mentioned, few educational sociologists seem to have read the literature about the effectiveness of the physician-patient relationship. The role of newspapers, though much studied in relation to elections, seems not to have been linked with study of education. Nor can I find much evidence that any sociologist has ever looked at the mountainous literature on the effectiveness of advertising -- the effort to "teach people something" on which most money has been spent for evaluation.

The example of the physician takes point from our continual failure to establish unequivocal connections between characteristics of teachers and what their pupils learn as a result of instruction. Many of the frustrating non-effects of expensive new curricula are relevant also here; at the least, they demonstrate that the teacher rarely is epiphenomenal. They hint at the fact that teacher and pupil interact not only with each other but also through the mediating influence of the curriculum.

That there are cultural "nests" of families or communities with "educogenic" aspirations has long been known. Thus, French data demonstrate that departmental levels of literacy in the late 17th century predict mid-19th century disparities in elementary attendance rates by departments. No one needs to be reminded of how many studies have been made about the subtleties of family influences, but so long as we lack good models for this area, it will be easy to fall victim to fallacies. It has become logistically possible to assemble larger quantities of material about attitudes of

parents who now have children in school, and it always comes out that parental attitudes do correlate well with offsprings' performance. But if the data are cross-sectional, it is highly likely that many of the parents' responses reflect how well their children have been doing in school. This impasse can be avoided only by longitudinal data.

The subtleties of "social status" are not exhausted by this example. In the international study of mathematics achievement, for example, pupils' scores were associated with paternal occupation and with parental schooling in all countries, but the magnitude of that correlation was astonishingly varied among the countries. Moreover, the lowest SES pupils in some countries outscored (on a common test) high-SES pupils in other countries. Indeed for any society, if one tabulates an index of educational performance against conventional social rubrics, the subpopulations will display a vast range in the relationships. Pupils who are black, southern, rural, low income, with an illiterate father, poorly trained teachers, etc. taken as one combination will be vastly unlike pupils who are the opposite on each factor.

These illustrations also undergird the importance of studying the processes of mobility through analysis of discrepant cases and through scrutiny of non-routine patterns of educational-occupational careers. Again, we see the importance of micro data that can be linked up with micro-economic data to derive educational "production functions" and to identify school differences in achievement by linking pupils' scores back to the actual school districts, economic areas, etc. Not least, such ways of handling data provide some prophylaxis against the sorts of reification discussed below.

6. Reification of Sociological Variables and Exaggeration of the Effects on Schools

Perhaps the most destructive reification is oversimplified ideas about socio-economic status, "social class," or SES for short. Many investigators are obsessed with constructing composite indexes, unfortunately then we usually are unable to identify what about status had the putative influence. Moreover, it is especially in studies of education that we need to identify what particular aspects of the child's environment were influential. One needs also to keep in mind that the random or transitory component is always largest at the extreme of a distribution. "The disadvantaged," that is, are not a group or even a stable statistical category but an attribute of certain families at a certain time. Just how stable the membership of this category is is one of the main things about it that we wish to know. Similarly, we deceive ourselves by our habits of talking about "the middle class" or about "middle-class culture." Apart from the ontological issues discussed, one needs also to know just which persons a pupil compares himself with actually, not according to some self-chosen spokesman for the "disadvantaged" child.

In actuality, there is no "the SES" for a whole school, nor even for a whole classroom. Following the suggestions of W. I. Thomas, one might say that neither a family nor a child has a definite and stable SES. It is therefore sterile to choose schools to represent "a stratum," for we need to know precisely how much inter-pupil variability exists within the school on the independent variables. Nor does a low score average on SES or on some scale (as of "efficacy") supply much explanatory power for a particular child's performance. How does the degree of "bureaucratization" of a school directly influence the behavior of a pupil? We do not know whether a child

sees this quality of a school in the same way the investigator or the teacher does. Nor do we have more than a few clues as to which bureaucratic elements of a school would facilitate or hinder learning by this or that sort of pupil. One could rephrase many of these queries and apply them to criticizing the many studies of "reluctant pupils."

7. The Career Payoff from Education

Where there are formal schools, they are expected on the one hand to exert a homogenizing effect upon pupils: to teach a common language, a society-wide set of measurement units, certain moral habits such as promptness, etc. The schools are expected also to identify if not to create differences among the pupils: to mark out and encourage those who are "college material," to help pupils identify their own interests or strengths, to prepare some individuals for an elite role while convincing others they should not aspire to excell their betters. While all these sorts of effects are bound up closely with the "mobility function" of schools, few who philosophize about schools realize that only a small proportion of any generation can be mobile relatively. Usually commentators forget also that one's conclusions are different if he relates the amount of mobility to the size of the stratum individuals move out of or to the size of the stratum they move into. If the latter, a small proportion of lower-stratum persons entering the elite can dominate it.

Every education system uses part of its operating time to select pupils for promotion. That selection is always in some measure also a contribution to the allocation of individuals to various adult roles. Whether this contribution by the schools, contrasted with the contribution by other

societal agencies, is greater in some than in other societies remains as yet undetermined. There are relatively large enrollments in the upper levels of the Japanese school system and their average achievement on tests is high, yet a very large proportion of Japanese university graduates are employed in middle-level jobs despite a steady up-grading the nation's occupational structure. Should one speak of Japan as a society in which education plays a large part in mobility?

The distribution of schooling or training over different segments of individuals' lifetimes can vary from time to time or place to place. In the most technological societies, about as many resources are spent on training workers after they begin employment as were spent getting those individuals through their basic or common schooling. The relationship between school and what individuals gain from the schooling they or others receive obviously is affected not only by how schooling is distributed among the population and the subpopulations. It is affected also by how this schooling, training, and other sorts of education are distributed over a worker's lifetime.

Withal, the correlation between a population's schooling and their incomes or occupations is modest, which is not to say that education fails to pay its way. Nor does it say that society should insure that the relative benefit to the best educated should be raised to a more impressive height, though demand may assure that outcome. Schooling, as Blau and Duncan showed, remains the most powerful re-sorter of individual statuses over which a society has a command. Using Duncan's matrix of eight factors (Eugenics Quarterly, March, 1968, p. 2), a tantalizing query arises. Could one design any practicable rearrangement of our educational system that would alter any of the coefficients by as much as .10? For example, would a new sort of

school system raise the correlation between schooling and earnings upward or downward by more or less than it would change the correlation between schooling and occupation?

8. The Distinctiveness of Academic from Other Occupations has Become Attenuated

The urge to "intellectualize" all occupations was one of the heritages of the enlightenment, and it took a very home-grown form in the "land-grant philosophy." It has remained a major theme, not unrelated to pragmatism, in this nation. But, given the wide range of quality within each educational level, that aim gives rise to some incompatible policies; for example, we have had a populist philosophy that every public college should be a "service center" for its clientele or fiscal sponsors. This is not the place to comment on the many outcomes of these clashes of outlook: the college as a "collective representation" of its public, the sacrifice of intellectual quality to the provision of "opportunities for all," and the struggle to improve the best colleges while bringing lagging ones "up to standard." Clustered around each of these topics one finds a host of political and educational controversies and a vast multiplication of data designed to identify "college characteristics" and to relate the latter to the function of different sorts of college in national life.

One basic question emerges that is in some ways typical of many but that is a challenge especially to those who would first pursue "quality": Can "cosmopolitan" individuals produce viable and satisfying "local" communities and an integral society? This query implies also: Can discipline-focused teachers or professors, in contrast to community-rooted ones, produce

graduates who will be satisfied with other than what we now call an "alienated" outlook on life?

Combining these queries and their corollaries, a growing number of investigators are raising new questions about educational policy. One, already mentioned, refers to the relative claims of the "privileged majority" who clamor for even more "free" post-secondary schooling as against the claims of the large (and partly overlapping) army of youth who began school with great handicaps and have fallen further behind each year. Another question refers to the impact of rapid change in pedagogy (e.g., new curricula in science) or of higher levels of attained schooling upon the older and less-trained "vintages" of men or women threatened not only by a generation gap but by an assault in principle upon seniority rights and occupational security. One answer to this dilemma may be to devise new patterns of age-cycling of schooling or training in order to stave off obsolescence of skills.

For over a century we have had it drummed into our ears that expansion of schools would not only raise the qualifications of all workers but also equip a growing army of men and women to serve as links between the world of learning or research and the life of ordinary people. But as expansion of academic life has brought increased allegiance among the academics to their discipline in preference to their college or its supporting community, we have gradually become alert to the limited practical utility of the counsel or pronouncements by academics about daily affairs. Teachers' associations seem not be very single minded about improving the learning conditions for the average child. Physicians also require to be brought under scrutiny of representatives of the public. But with progressive separation of workplace from home, fewer children each year have any adult role models available

for the "serious" activities of life, as distinguished from the cinema or TV stars who serve as models for a life of non-work and of non-concern for the actual and local "problems" confronting a badly wracked society. "Expressive" models multiply more rapidly than do models for "instrumental" action. So, while a growing proportion of individuals receive many years of contact with the techniques of learning and with the accumulated hoards of knowledge, the persuasive effect of "educated" persons upon the making of policy for the "real problems" of an occupation or a community diminishes at least as rapidly as schooling expands. Study of the several sorts of anomy that are hidden in these examples, while less dramatic perhaps than study of "drug cults," lies at the heart of any comprehensive "sociology of education."

9. Our Traditional Evasiveness about Moral Education must be Abandoned

As most of us know, the preponderantly secular and cognitive reputation of our schools is not of long standing. But not all see equally clearly that "moral education" is always at the core of school lessons in any society, as even more so is it a part of the "unwritten curriculum." The hoary debate between the upholders of "general" and of "vocational" schooling turns essentially on this issue, but the question is not solely as to which of those two sorts of schooling is most worthwhile. There is also the deeper question as to what kind of "human nature" is assumed if we favor cognitive or if we favor affective materials. (Of course the "moral" element is not restricted to the "affective.")

Nearly all debates about curriculum turn on that dichotomy. In the more strident controversies (as about how to educate ethnic minorities in large cities), the search for solutions leads to proposals for some kind of

"custodial" school. We find ourselves driven to reexamining long-held assumptions about the linkages between family and school. Despite realization that "custodial" proposals are condescending, increasingly we hear the question whether the moral education needed for preservation of societal integrity can be inculcated under any other arrangement.

Yet we find ourselves facing the dilemma that while we wish to have the schools encourage an ecumenical attitude toward other nations and races, each minority is encouraged to close itself into a classroom for lessons in parochial ethnic studies -- of how many kinds depending on the heterogeneity of the community. All proposals for legitimizing a subculture through making it a part of the agenda of curricula in the school bog down over the issue of which moral norms to incorporate and what is the most effective mix of the subculture and the broader "national" culture. To be sure, lessons used to foster socialization always aim partly at some general norms as well as at some particularistic norms, but knowing this gives us little help concretely in deciding which mixture is best for a given time and place. And none of the prescriptions tell us how to determine what of the material taught actually is learned.

That the "unwritten curriculum" (including unwitting correspondence between teacher's and pupil's culture) mainly embodies the moral part of the curriculum hardly points out just what should be attempted by teachers and what should be allowed to "just happen." The part of an individual's lifetime he can spend in school is limited. Even if a general agreement were reached about the place for "special" norms within the curriculum, selection of the particular embodiment of those norms still must be worked out, justified, and evaluated. For example, suppose we wish to use school lessons to enhance the self-confidence of girls for responsible jobs and to increase

the receptivity of boys for girls as workmates, we still have to choose whether to emphasize "ultimate" norms about occupational life or whether the approach would preferably be through instrumental norms about "sex-linked" roles. A society in our day must decide to what extent it will leave explicitly moral instruction to non-school agencies (including the mass media) and to what extent this task must be taken on openly by the schools -- which immediately raises questions about "freedom of instruction," "freedom to reject instruction," "freedom of sponsorship of education," and so on. We face the possibility that what we remove from schools (in such a society as Sweden or the United States) we must introduce into mass-service organizations such as a universal-service conscripted army.

10. The Curriculum is a "Cultural Form" That is being Constantly Recreated

This theme (borrowed from the writings of Znaniecki) is perhaps best exemplified in the part played by Latin as the backbone of western education over so many centuries. One could say also that the main function of schools is to preserve the system of schools. Surely Chinese characters have played an indispensable part in giving solidity and persistence to Sinic culture. That many pupils barely learned the rudiments of Latin does not gainsay that drill in it preserved the basic structure and ethos upon which modern generations have been able to erect diversified and formidable structures of instruction. Despite undeniable dysfunctionalities of that traditional western pattern of formalized instruction for the life of contemporary Tanzania or even Boston, the pattern also has been able to take root and flourish in a hundred new national entities during the last generation and in each begin to lay the groundwork for modernity.

And whenever schools are used by more than a huddling portion of a people, curricula have possessed also those marks of custom that Durkheim designated as "exteriority" and as "constraint." Every generation undeniably must face anew the search for suitable exemplars of the chosen "curriculum" who can serve adequately as living models for youth, but the content of school curricula is always being broadened -- or supplemented by private-venture forms of training -- to embrace not sterile pedantry only but also patterns of marketable skills. The constraint inherent in school lessons, expressed though it may be in a thousand modes, is always legitimized by the fact that prestige but also something more than the barren prestige of mere pedantry comes out of successful rehearsing of the curriculum.

As Znaniecki elaborated in other connections, the status of the teacher always is equivocal or ambiguous. He (only recently she) should be the faithful enacter of a curriculum in some manner validated by the society, varying though his pedagogical skill may be. The teacher faces the challenge of instructing in lore or activities that he has never participated in creating and that he may never have seen embodied in the daily life of any living person -- a problem of special importance in "developing" societies and surely one reason that the lessons so often are comprised mainly of the 3-Rs. And, since schools are always expected to give at least some rudimentary pre-vocational instruction, teachers who will accept the modest salary of the teacher must be enticed from ongoing productive activities.

One can draw together many of the themes in this area of investigation by working out a simple classification of the content of those cultural forms that we call curricula. Every formalized curriculum contains material exemplifying each of these four categories, though the proportions vary in time and place and the content of instruction in every society is distinctive.

Each type is taught with varying effectiveness and thoroughness in different circumstances. Every major controversy about education in our own society in our day is tacit in the scheme.

	Universal	Parochial
Cognitive	a) e.g., mathematics	b) e.g., history
Affective	c) e.g., great literature	d) e.g., "nationalism"

II. Influence of the Teacher

It is a verbal fashion today to assert that schools are "destructive" to the personalities and the potentials of a large part of the pupils enrolled in them; I am not impressed by such cavalier hyperbole on the part of modern adherents of the philosophy of the noble savage. There is actually abundant evidence that insofar as pupils receive encouragement to remain in school against the pleadings of parents or peers, it is the teacher who normally should receive the credit. How much scope there is for a teacher to be so effective a model of course depends also upon the extent to which a child has other accessible adult models for different spheres of conduct. Various categories of teachers and various individual teachers enjoy quite disparate prestige, the factors of which can hardly be explored here: the status of pupils' parents compared to that of the teacher, the growing likelihood that many pupils will transcend the teacher's adult status, the upholding or the denigration of the teacher by parents, etc. As in all "person serving" occupations, it is difficult to separate the status or prestige of the server from his or her "authority." (It is a safe bet that we soon will witness a groundswell from youth that teachers' exert more authority over their insecure lives.)

Only for the primary grades does pedagogy rest on a solid basis of research, the findings of which have accumulated for over a century. For many reasons, equally useful and valid techniques are much more difficult to engender for the instruction of adolescent and post-adolescent youth. Accordingly, it is easier to "professionalize" the teacher of small children; pupils' motivations at this level can be treated as parameters rather than as "noise."

Creation of a dependable "craft lore" for instructing older pupils is high on the priority list for research in the area of pedagogy. While it seems difficult to draw many lessons from the older "noble" professions such as medicine, we are also being cautioned that they may not know how to produce effective purveyors of their technical lore better than do the mass professions such as teaching. Unfortunately, this set of questions has been contaminated by controversies about whether the teacher must embody the culture of his pupils in order effectively to instruct them, for example. Perhaps the impersonal and "authoritarian" teacher may inculcate more if he has the skill of pedagogy than does the empathizer. But as among practitioners in every trade, teachers resist having their manner of doing their work altered by outsiders. And the growing strength of teachers' organizations and the inflation of their incomes without improved competence, when joined to the sluggish research on pedagogical processes, presents societies with a dolorous prospect. There is emerging for teachers, as they become part of the largest and a mass profession, a tension between their "trade union traditions" and two other roles: a) as adult exemplar of the highest moral values of the society and b) as upholders of an ancient tradition that protection of dissent is society's only protection for its sources of dependable knowledge. As an increasing number of teachers come to occupy the

ambivalent status of secondary or junior college teachers, choice between allegiance to the "upper" or scholarly segments of the academic system and the "lower" or child-oriented segments becomes increasingly tension-laden.

12. There Can Be No Accurate "Fit" of an Educational System to a Society

If this dictum be true, I am saying that even if we cope to our best with all the other problems or dilemmas set forth in previous pages, we cannot hold out hope that as a result we will be able to design just the educational system that a given society most needs. It was the "manpower planners" who over the past couple of decades sought to identify the basic parameters of an occupational structure in order to design appropriate outputs of types and levels of skill in "needed" quantities. Other investigators have concentrated on listing the respects in which the schools of a society are failing to serve their clients, leaving some pupils virtually uneducated though schooled and giving to others a disproportionate part of the educational heritage of the society and of the "payoff" from schooling. Neither these nor other efforts at "fitting" schools to society have proved productive. Indeed, the discussions degenerate usually into vague comparisons of actual schools with some "ideal school."

In one instance, studies of the contribution from education to social mobility demonstrate that while schooling is not a dominant factor, it outweighs any other, often including socio-economic background. Yet the seemingly parallel line of inquiry into the notion of "a culture of poverty" (to be overcome by especially diligent and suitable instruction) has proved elusive and indeterminate if not circular in logic.

It is therefore a good investment of investigative resources to pursue comparative studies (both synchronic and diachronic) in the search for

functional equivalents of the principal elements in effective educational systems. In that process we will come closer to ascertaining whether formal or informal education plays a comparatively larger part in some than in other societies in the task of preparing individuals for adult roles and specifically as a factor in mobility. For example, search worldwide for the equivalent of the English "sixth form" will illuminate the manner and the outcome of selection within the schools and upon how schools contribute to the allocation of individuals to various adult roles.

Every system of education is multifunctional, as I have reiterated many times, though the functions are patterned broadly in accordance with the "type" or "level" of the society. This multifunctionality goes far to explain why a close "fit" between school and society is unlikely to be observed, and certainly not in dynamic societies. It helps us to understand why the outcome of schooling in any society or subculture depends upon the nature of the societal milieu within which that system of education is operating. By comparison to knowledge of that context, an inventory of the "goals" of the system is of quite trivial importance. From the research viewpoint, this multifunctionality brings the incidental benefit that intra-educational elements vary widely and thereby offer challenging openings for diversified research attacks upon the question of "the function" of education as a salient theme within sociology.

As I said at the opening, the dozen topics chosen may be among the most important but they hardly exhaust the list of important themes. Parts of each section of this commentary could be collated and related to the contemporary dispute about devolution of authority over schools to local "communities." Though many of the comments in each section are set forth quite

confidently, a more candid style would have framed many points in a more hypothetic mode. Throughout the twelve themes, for example, runs a dominant refrain of educational philosophy to be observed all over the world: the struggle for universalistic standards and for equity in the allocation of individuals to the part they will play in the emergence of a new epoch in the life of their societies. Much of the boring housework of schools exists mainly because schools are distinctively committed to this ideal of universalism, to the search for the best balance between equity and efficiency.

PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH WORKSHOP ON SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Small Grant Finalists

Barry Anderson
Graduate Institute of Education
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

Jerome B. Dusek
Department of Psychology
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

Michael T. Hannan
Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Thomas F. Mayer
Department of Sociology
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Carolyn C. Perrucci
Department of Sociology
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47904

Paul M. Roman
Department of Sociology
Newcomb College, Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

David R. Segal
Department of Sociology
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Miles E. Simpson
Department of Sociology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Michael Useem
Department of Sociology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Resource Persons

C. Arnold Anderson
Comparative Education Center
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637

John C. Claudy
American Institutes for Research
P.O. Box 1113
Palo Alto, California 94302

Ronald G. Corwin
Department of Sociology
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Junius A. Davis
Educational Testing Service
Southeastern Office
Durham, North Carolina 27701

Glen H. Elder, Jr.
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Howard Hjelm
National Center for Educational
Research and Development
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

Joe L. Spaeth
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Special Observers

Carole Parsons
Division of Behavioral Sciences
National Research Council
Washington, D. C. 20418

Irwin Deutscher
Department of Sociology
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Barbara F. Meeker
Committee on Basic Research in Education
National Research Council
Washington, D. C. 20418

Sherman Ross, Executive Secretary
Committee on Basic Research in Education
National Research Council
Washington, D. C. 20418

Workshop Director

Bruce K. Eckland
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Workshop Coordinators

Byron A. Matthews
Division of Social Sciences
University of Maryland
Baltimore County
5401 Wilkins Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21228

James W. Michaels
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514